The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Office Action mailed on September 28, 2010. At the time the Examiner mailed the Office Action claims 1-25 were pending. By way of the present response the Applicants have: 1) amended claims 1 and 15; 2) added no new claims; and 3) canceled claims 2 and 3. As such, claims 1 and 3-25 are now pending. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application and the allowance of all claims now represented.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4 - 6, 11, 13 -17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wygodny, et al, U.S. Patent 6,202,199, (hereinafter "Wygodny"). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, and 20 to include limitations or similar limitations from some of the dependent claims. Applicants will address the rejections claims 1-14 in the 103 section below as elements of claim 3 have been incorporated into claim 1. An element of claim 3 has also been incorporated into claim 15 and thus it will also be addressed in the 103 section below.

With respect to claim 20, Wygodny does not describe:

> receiving debug information from a computer
> > program upon the occurrence of an error
> > during execution of the program code;
> applying configuration parameters to the debug
> > information to create a debug information
> > node; and
> transmitting the debug information node via the
> > network adaptor to a remote computer.

Wygodny does not apply configuration parameters to create anything much less a debug information node. Applicants do not understand what the Office Action's assertion that a "debug node is just debug information represents

Appl. No.: 10/550,851   8   Atty. Docket No.: 42P21031
Amdt. dated **12-27-10**
Reply to the Office action **of** 09/28/2010

a particular client" is supposed to be addressing. Regardless, Wygodny does not describe the limitations of this claim.

Accordingly, Wygodny does not describe claim 20. Claims 21-25 are dependent on claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same rationale.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wygodny, in view of Willems, U.S. Patent 6,983,452 (hereinafter "Willems"). In the amendment to claim 1, Applicants have added content from dependent claims 2 and 3. As such, Applicants are addressing the rejection for claim 3 as it seems most pertinent. With respect to claim 3, the combination does not describe:

> A method, comprising:
> executing a program code on a first computer system;
> halting execution of the program code upon an occurrence of an error during execution;
> generating debug information upon the occurrence of the error during execution of the program code, wherein generating debug information is performed by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver;
> transmitting the debug information to the network print driver;
> resuming execution of the program code after transmitting the debug information to the network print driver; and
> transmitting the debug information to a second computer system via a network adaptor.

First, the combination does not describe "halting execution of the program code upon an occurrence of an error during execution." The Office Action cites Willem as allegedly describing this limitation. Specifically, the Office Action cites Willem's col. 5, lines 8-20. This section reads:

> The collection driver of the symbolic kernel debugger is operating system specific. It is capable of taking snapshots of the target machine system

> state according to an input record list provided by
> the user interface command plug-in. Coherency of
> each snapshot is enforced through use of an
> operating system call to suspend execution of all
> processes and threads other than the collection
> driver itself for the time it takes to capture the
> snapshot. After the snapshot is collected, the
> suspended processes and threads are restarted so
> that operation can continue. This frequently
> permits capture of snapshots without visible
> disruption of system operation.

As detailed, the OS of the target machines suspends execution of everything to take a snapshot of the system at a particular point in time. Snapshots allow " service personnel to observe how the system state changes with time." However, there is nothing in Willem to remotely suggest that execution is halted on an error. Moreover, Wygodny's system is incompatible with halting execution on an error. Specifically, Wygodny describes the collection of trace information "without the need for a context switch, and then allows the client to continue running." (Wygodny, col. 5, lines 1-3.) Hence the use of "attaching" in Wygodny.

The combination does not describe "generating debug information upon the occurrence of the error during execution of the program code, wherein generating debug information is performed by executing a function call in the program code to a network print driver." The Office Action as asserted that Wygodny describes this. Specifically, that Office Action states

> Note that Wygodny discloses a method for
> developer to access to trace information of a client
> computer remotely, thus internet is needed for the
> trace information to be transmitted back to the
> developer, the network print driver is just a
> network protocol to transfer file from one
> computer to another...

However, the claim calls for debug information to be generated by executing a function call to a network print driver. The Office Action's assessment is simply not relevant to generating debug information.

The combination does not describe "transmitting the debug information to the network print driver." First the debug information is not generated as claimed. Moreover, there is no network print driver discussed in either reference generic assertion aside.

The combination does not describe "resuming execution of the program code after transmitting the debug information to the network print driver." The combination does not halt execution to generate debug information and therefore does not resume after that neither.

Finally, the combination does not describe "transmitting the debug information to a second computer system via a network adaptor." Again, the debug information is created differently and therefore not described by the combination.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe claim 1 as a whole. Claims 4-14 are dependent on claim 1 and allowable for at least the same rationale.

With respect to claim 15,

> executing a program code stored in a first
>   computer system;
> <u>halting execution of the program code upon an</u>
>   <u>occurrence of an error during execution;</u>
> <u>building a debug information node upon the</u>
>   <u>occurrence of the error during execution of</u>
>   <u>the program code; and</u>
> <u>invoking a network print driver to transmit the</u>
>   <u>debug information node to a second</u>
>   <u>computer system through a network</u>
>   <u>adaptor</u>

First, the combination does not describe "halting execution of the program code upon an occurrence of an error during execution." As detailed above, the combination does not describe halting execution on an error.

Appl. No.: 10/550,851   11   Atty. Docket No.: 42P21031
Amdt. dated **12-27-10**
Reply to the Office action **of** 09/28/2010

Second, the combination does not describe "building a debug information node upon the occurrence of the error during execution of the program code" for at least the previous reason.

Finally, the combination does not describe "invoking a network print driver to transmit the debug information node to a second computer system through a network adaptor." There is zero mention of a "network print driver" in either reference. The Office Action's overly broad assertion that this is disclosed is unfounded. Applicants respectfully submit that they do not believe that the Office will find any instance of a network print driver used in this manner.

Accordingly, the combination does not describe what claim 15 requires. Claims 16-19 are dependent on claim 15 and are allowable for at least the same rationale.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections have been overcome and that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account Number 02-2666. If a telephone conference would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact David F. Nicholson at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 12/23/10

/David F. Nicholson/
David F. Nicholson
Reg. No.: 62,888

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300